

FARMINGTON CITY – CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

JANUARY 19, 2021

WORK SESSION

Joining via Zoom: Mayor Jim Talbot; City Manager Shane Pace; City Councilmembers Brett Anderson, Scott Isaacson, Shawn Beus, Amy Shumway, and Rebecca Wayment; City Recorder Heidi Bouck; Community Development Director Dave Petersen; Associate City Planner Meagan Booth; Planning and GIS Specialist Shannon Hansell; Assistant City Manager/Economic Development Director Brigham Mellor; Finance Director Greg Davis; City Attorney Todd Godfrey; and Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston.

Mayor **Jim Talbot** called the work session to order at 6:03 p.m.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRESENTATION

The work session was held to consider a presentation on affordable housing.

Councilman **Shawn Beus** said housing remains a hot topic in many cities. He said the Housing Committee's past meetings have been very productive. Councilwoman **Amy Shumway** said this could help restore the City's downtown in the future.

Community Development Director **Dave Petersen** addressed the Council. In 2018, of the 6,433 households in Farmington, 926 (or 14.4 percent) were less than 80 percent of the Housing Area Median Family Income (HAMFI). With 705 units available, that resulted in a shortfall of 221 affordable housing units. Assuming 6,307 new households are added in the next 30 years, no new affordable housing units are created, and the same HAMFI ratio, the shortfall will grow to 1,130 units by 2050. Of those new households expected between 2020 and 2050, 4,886 (or 77.5 percent) are projected to be in the mixed use area; 747 (or 11.8 percent) in subdivisions; and 674 (or 10.7 percent) infill. **Petersen** said infill takes decades and happens quite a bit when large parcels get split. Farmington is like three cities in one: mixed use, outside the mixed use, and Lagoon.

The question is how to fill the gap for affordable housing within the City. Options include Redevelopment Agency (RDA) funds using rental or owner-occupied units; Tax Credit Projects; Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs); Section 8 Housing Vouchers; and other projects.

RDA funds

Using RDA funds is an option. The City's RDA fund now includes \$1 million, which must be spent on affordable housing by state law. Due to the new Community Reinvestment Act Areas (CRAs) now established in the Golden Triangle (the area south of Shepard Lane, north of Clark Lane, east of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Rail Trail, and west of the Union Pacific tracks) and a possible third CRA on the Evans property, it is anticipated that this amount will increase to \$7 million to \$10 million in the next few years.

The City may not meet state recommended affordable housing thresholds if RDA funds are the sole source of revenue and the following additional assumptions hold correct: 1) Considering

that rental-occupied units cost \$18,000 per unit, the City could use RDA funds to create 389 to 556 units, resulting in a shortfall of between 741 to 574 units needed to satisfy affordable housing needs. 2) Considering that owner-occupied units cost \$85,000 per unit, the City could use RDA funds to create 82 to 118 units, resulting in a shortfall of between 1,048 to 1,012 units needed to satisfy affordable housing needs.

There are pros and cons to owner-occupied affordable housing alternatives. The pros include: It makes it possible for some making under 80 percent of HAMFI to create equity on a limited basis before year 15, pride of ownership, and positive public relations. The cons include: These units typically remain affordable owner-occupied for 15 years, unlike rental-occupied units, which provide an affordable housing option for much longer. If only RDA funds are used, owner-occupied units are nearly five times more expensive to create as an affordable housing option than rental-occupied.

If the City decides to provide owner-occupied affordable housing alternatives in addition to renter-occupied units, options could include RDA funds; Tax Credit Projects; or a new ordinance requiring all developers/subdividers to set aside a certain percentage of new development, or a fee in lieu, specific to owner-occupied units.

Considering RDA funds, RDA funds are a very poor cost-to-benefit ratio. Some owner-occupied units may be possible, but even just a few may compromise efforts to meet state housing goals overall. If the ADU market becomes more robust and a quantifiable affordable housing option, RDA money can be spent on owner-occupied units elsewhere, but still relatively few in number.

Tax Credit Projects

Tax Credit Projects are most often used for renter-occupied projects. However, they can be used for owner-occupied units as well. **Petersen** said RDA funds can be seen as seed money to attract tax credit developers.

New city ordinance requiring setting aside affordable housing units

Regarding a new ordinance requiring a percentage of owner-occupied affordable units in all new development, there are several things to consider including: 1) a flat rate, 2) helping a developer's pro-forma pencil via a percentage or fee in lieu, 3) density bonuses, and 4) providing lots in exchange.

1) The flat percentage would be fair. A graduated scale requiring more of large developers may not prove productive, as there is not a lot of land left in Farmington for large developments.

Petersen said developers could be exempt if they have 10 units or fewer.

2) To help a developer's pro-forma pencil, the percentage and/or fee in lieu must result in a high dollar amount. A developer's profit margins must be large to begin with in order to hedge risk. A 10 percent fee in lieu may cut developer profit substantially more than just 10 percent. A developer may pass any fee expense on to the market rate units, resulting in increased housing

costs overall. If profits are decreased too much, it may constitute a taking and/or result in legal action.

3) Density bonuses may make the numbers work for the property owner, but increased density is often unpopular and can be a controversial issue. To make a development financially viable, each bonus given will be different because pro-forma variables will be different from one property to the next. It may be wise to have the “density bonus” tool available regardless for discretionary use for such areas as the Rock Manor apartments on State Route 106 east of the Chevron.

4) Another option is use of the City’s zoning ordinance to provide additional lots to developers and owners in exchange for affordable housing instead of open space. An argument against this is that the City has not met its open space goals yet and the stance may have grave consequences. An argument for this is that the City has almost met its open space goals except for a few more trails. It may be time to leverage the 1999 downzone to something like affordable housing instead of open space.

The first subdivision in Farmington was built in 1959. Between 1959 and 1999, some 3,000 plats were created. In 1999, the City approved the Open Space Ordinance, cutting densities in half in exchange for open space considerations. In order to get the pre-1999 densities, the developer had to provide open space. Now, the trail, park, and storm water networks are coming together and the City’s open space needs are close to being filled. The City does not prefer more pocket parks.

ADUs

ADUs represent another option to provide affordable housing. Between 2002 and 2018, the City received applications or approved only 14 ADUs—less than one per year. However, in 2019, the number increased to seven and then three in 2020. If the City approved five ADUs per year—which is a conservative estimate in comparison to what other cities now accomplish—the community may realize 150 ADUs by 2020. However, not all of these may end up being affordable.

Other options

Considering these options, the City may not have the tools in place now to meet the affordable housing thresholds recommended by the state. Other options to be considered include 1) Tax Credit Projects, 2) Section 8 Housing Vouchers, and 3) other projects.

Tax Credit Projects can help fill the affordable housing shortfall gap at little or no cost to the City. However, the City can use property it owns or acquires, or housing funds to incentivize and attract tax credit developers.

The Davis Housing Authority provides a limited number of Section 8 housing vouchers that can be spent anywhere in the County. **Petersen** said Davis County has 1,000 housing vouchers available. Conversations with the Authority show that Farmington is a desirable place to live

and the more options that are made, even at market rate, the more vouchers will be used in the Farmington community related to this program.

Crown Housing, Habitat, and Davis School District/Davis Applied Technology College (DATC) projects can also provide options, even owner-occupied alternatives for affordable housing, but only a relative few to meet the needs. However, programs such as these can often result in positive public relations for Farmington. **Petersen** said Davis County only does five or fewer Crown Housing projects a year. There is only one Habit Homes per year in Davis County. The DATC and Davis School District only do a handful of homes each year.

Assistant City Manager/Economic Development Director **Brigham Mellor** said that with owner-occupied units, the City is responsible for filling the gap between affordable and market rates. With the renter option, it is not just the city, as the federal government can also help contribute to the deficit. In fact, the federal government's contribution has the potential to be more substantial than the City's contribution.

City Manager **Shane Pace** said that as housing such as an apartment complex ages, it will likely become more affordable.

Councilman **Brett Anderson** said he is in favor of incentives rather than compelling people to do things. He doesn't like the government telling people to do things. If people are making the choice instead, it is less heavy handed and more of a win-win situation. While it sits better with him, he is not sure if it will stand up to legal scrutiny.

Councilwoman **Rebecca Wayment** said she likes incentivizing. She prefers use of a new city ordinance providing lots in exchange for developers providing affordable housing. While the City can come up with other great ideas, it won't matter if developers balk and fail to follow those ideas.

Pace said developers posture, saying cities are the impediment to affordable housing due to fees. However, even if fees decrease, the price of homes likely won't likewise decrease. He said developers would be open to density bonuses and providing lots in exchange for affordable housing. However, city residents will likely disapprove of the City giving density bonuses.

Mayor Talbot said developers are not sold on affordable housing yet, and density bonuses could help them swallow it. He said no major developers in Farmington are currently doing affordable housing. He said he was initially leaning toward the percentage/fee in lieu, which could be tweaked to see if developers will buy off on it.

Beus said **Kirt Peterson**, a developer on the Housing Committee, likes the required percentage or fee in lieu option, saying if it is not a prescriptive measure, developers won't do it.

Councilman **Scott Isaacson** said there is no "one size fits all" for various types of situations. He likes having various tools available for maximum flexibility. He would like to know how many can be available at the same time. He likes the option of providing lots in exchange for affordable housing. He would like information on other places both in and outside Utah that have done this successfully.

Shumway said that most of Farmington's future affordable housing will be inside the "donut hole" of the business park area. The City should focus on what is best for that area and the developers coming in to that area.

Petersen said there is a State Legislature bill in the works that will make ADUs a permitted use statewide. **Pace** said he thinks the bill will pass this year.

Beus said that compared to other cities in Davis County, Farmington's shortfall of affordable housing is very similar. Clearfield and Sunset are the exception, as they provide more affordable housing.

City Attorney **Todd Godfrey** said he appreciates the City Council's prioritization of these options, and he wants the opportunity to do a deeper dive on the legal issues associated with them that may affect the City long term.

UPCOMING REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

Mayor Talbot said the Farmington Creek Estates Phase III PUD drainage easement agenda item initially came up five years ago and had a lot of public comment then. He warned this is a sticky issue. The Council and the Planning Commission both struggled with it for some time in the past. However, five years ago the proposal was to develop that area into lots, not just a barn, as is currently proposed.

Petersen said it was placed on today's agenda as a public hearing in an effort to be transparent, and so residents have the chance to understand what is going on there. The applicant owns the entire parcel, which is subject to a drainage easement. The easement was put in place in the past because there was not a tool to solidify the parcel's use as open space.

REGULAR SESSION

Joining via Zoom: Mayor Jim Talbot; City Manager Shane Pace; City Councilmembers Brett Anderson, Scott Isaacson, Shawn Beus, Amy Shumway, and Rebecca Wayment; City Recorder Heidi Bouck; Community Development Director Dave Petersen; Associate City Planner Meagan Booth; Planning and GIS Specialist Shannon Hansell; Assistant City Manager/Economic Development Director Brigham Mellor; Finance Director Greg Davis; Assistant City Manager/City Engineer Chad Boshell; City Attorney Todd Godfrey; Historic Preservation Commission Chairman David Barney; and Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston.

CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor **Jim Talbot** called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call (Opening Comments/Invocation/Pledge of Allegiance)

Councilman **Scott Isaacson** offered the invocation, and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman **Brett Anderson**.

PRESENTATIONS:

Historic Preservation Commission Appointments

Historic Preservation Commission **Chairman David Barney** presented this agenda item. Appointments include **Charlotte Packer, Andrew Clark, David Livingston, and Karina Landward**. These new appointments bring number of commission members to the maximum of seven.

Packer has been volunteering at the museum for eight years, and has lived in Farmington all her life. **Clark** grew up in an historic home, and is now restoring an historic home at 368 West State Street. **Livingston** lived in San Diego for 35 years, owning and operating a construction company. He built three homes that reflected the character and historic feel of the area. He recently moved to 36 North Main in Farmington, and wants to restore that home, as well as another he purchased at 79 South 100 East. **Landward** moved to Farmington in 2019 and is an attorney with Kirton McConkie. She earned a doctorate degree from Brigham Young University and has worked in 30 states including New York and California. She has worked on a preservation committee for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and assisted with landmark historical designations.

Mayor Talbot said these are great people to have on the Commission. Commissioner **Shawn Beus**, the Council's liaison to the Commission, said these four are impressive, and the Commission has never been in better hands.

Motion:

Beus moved to accept **Charlotte Packer, Andrew Clark, David Livingston, and Karina Landward** as members of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Councilman **Scott Isaacson** seconded the motion, saying he has known **Packer** for several years. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Miscellaneous Zoning and Sign Ordinance Amendments

Mayor Talbot said it was not necessary to hold a separate public hearing for each item being considered with this agenda item.

Associate Planner **Meagan Booth** presented this agenda item. After dealing with the public in the last year, Staff noticed many miscellaneous things that they are proposing should be changed. The Planning Commission recommended two amendments before COVID hit, and held a public hearing in an open format to see if anyone had questions. On February 20, 2020, the Planning Commission recommended the City Council approve the ZT-4-20 and ZT-5-20 (i and j below). At the December 10, 2020, Planning Commission meeting, the Commission recommended that the City Council approve the zone text amendments, with little discussion on the changes.

The proposed text amendments of the Zoning Ordinance and Sign Ordinance include:

- a) ZT-19-20 Side Corner Yard Parking Restrictions similar to front yard
- b) ZT-20-20 Sign Ordinance for Residential Zones setback to 1 foot to property line versus 10 feet to property line
- c) ZT-21-20 The BR zone is not an historic district
- d) ZT-22-20 Sports Courts: Special Exception
- e) ZT-24-20 Berm Requirements in Mixed Use Zones
- f) ZT-25-20 Roof Pitch Requirements for Single Family Homes Chapter 28
- g) ZT-26-20 Open Storage in Residential Areas
- h) ZT-27-20 Fence Requirements in PUDs
- i) ZT-4-20 Require a Special Exception Application, versus a Conditional Use Application, in regards to Accessory Building Heights
- j) ZT-5-20 Accessory Building Location Standards in Single Family Residential Zones

Community Development Director **David Petersen** said there are many abandoned cars that the City has not addressed yet.

Mayor Talbot opened the Public Hearing at 7:25 p.m. Nobody signed up in person or electronically to address the Council on the issue. **Mayor Talbot** closed the Public Hearing.

Motion:

Isaacson moved that the City Council approve the enabling ordinance amending miscellaneous sections of City Zoning Ordinance and Sign Ordinance including findings A-J.

Findings:

- a. The ordinance limits parking in residential areas to properly designated parking spaces in the front yard and side corner yard, which results in more esthetically pleasing neighborhoods.

- b. Property sign often relays that the property is for sale or lease, advertising contemplated improvements, announcing the name of the builder, designer, owner or developer of a project, or warning against trespass. A sign placed 1 foot from the property line is visible to the passerby and is customarily done in residential neighborhoods.
- c. The Business Residential (BR) zone is not an historic district. This change clarifies the purpose statement while still stating the importance of historic resources located within the zone.
- d. A request to modify the setbacks for a sports court is a deviation from the fixed dimensional standard set forth in the 11-28-060. Therefore, the request should be reviewed as a special exception, which is in line with other amendments this year. The special exception criteria allow more oversight by the Planning Commission.
- e. A berm is a flat strip of land or raised bank, which does not always lend to a pedestrian-oriented environment and can act as a physical barrier. Therefore, the requirement should be removed from the mixed-use zones.
- f. Architecture is constantly changing and flat rooves are becoming more commonplace. This amendment removes the requirement for a pitched roof from the supplemental regulations.
- g. The removal of the word “required” better discourages the storage of junk in visible yard areas.
- h. A fence may be an appropriate perimeter treatment for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and can mitigate the impact of the development on existing neighborhood properties.
- i. In most cases, the property owner is asking for an exception to the height requirement required by the zoning ordinance. Because this is a fixed dimensional standard, the application type should be a special exception versus a conditional use. The approval standards in 11-3-045 will be used to evaluate approval or denial of a special exception application. Per Utah state Code 10-9a-507, “(2) (a) A conditional use SHALL be approved if reasonable conditions are proposed, or can be imposed, to mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in accordance with applicable standards.” Therefore as a Conditional Use, the height of an accessory building shall be approved if conditions are proposed to mitigate impacts. Regarding Special Exceptions, however, the Planning Commission has authority to approve or deny, through the approval standards, which gives more discretion to the city.”
- j. The existing phrase, “beyond the nearest corner of the main building” can be redundant and not needed, especially if such corner is placed right at the required setback line. The following amendment removes the interpretation of the nearest corner of the building. The text change better clarifies the primary intent of the existing language, which is accessory buildings are not allowed in the “required” front and side corner yards.

Councilman **Rebecca Wayment** seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Drainage Easement Amendment—Farmington Creek Estates Phase III PUD

City Planner **Shannon Hansell** presented this agenda item. The owner of Parcel 3 would like to amend the plat to abandon a portion of the storm drain easement in order to build a barn. Parcel 3 is designated as Open Space, with a dedicated easement. The proposed barn would be approximately 60 feet x 60 feet, and would house storage equipment for the maintenance of the parcel. No comments have been received from the neighbors so far. A ditch is on the north and west side.

Assistant City Manager/City Engineer **Chad Boshell** said all abutting existing homes drain to that property, and drainage must be allowed to and across that property. The proposed barn does not interfere with that drainage. The driveway, parking, and grading near Glover's Lane as noted on the site plan would need to be approved through a future site plan.

Applicant **Andy McFarland** addressed the council. He only wants to vacate a 60 foot x 60 foot portion of the easement. The ditch on the west belongs to Farmington City. Residents currently use the existing dirt road, which allows for access to the back of houses for things such as pool installations. The dirt patch for a couple of trucks to park on is already there.

Petersen said the underlying zone allows for a barn, and the easement encompasses the whole site.

Mayor Talbot opened the Public Hearing at 7:38 p.m.

Nick Nielson (843 S. Snowberry Lane, Farmington, Utah) lives on west side of this property and addressed the council. He said he attended a past City Council meeting where a proposed zone change on this property was discussed. The previous owner, **Candy Olsen**, proposed a zone change to a nature preserve with only one home. Residents of both Country Lane and Snowberry Lane commented then that they had purchased their homes with the understanding that the land in question would stay as a "nature preserve." **Olsen's** application was denied, which the residents understood meant that the City agreed with the neighbors' intentions to keep it as a "nature preserve." He is concerned about drainage issues; disrupting wildlife such as hawks and pheasants; and obstructing mountain views. He feels the barn is too big, and is worried about how high it will be.

Ben Barrus (872 Country Lane, Farmington, Utah), representing the developer since 2006, addressed the Council. He clarified that from the beginning this property was tagged as "open space" but with the possibility that a barn could be built on this parcel. Fieldstone may have sold it to their people with the idea of a "nature preserve," but it wasn't platted as such as part of that development. It was platted as "open space" dedicated as part of Farmington Creek Estates. There are some terminology misunderstandings.

Mayor Talbot closed the Public Hearing at 7:43 p.m. He mentioned that development in this area was a hot topic of discussion five years ago. However, City Councils and Planning Commissioners change over time.

Councilman **Brett Anderson** said he remembers the past dispute, which involved a proposal for up to four houses. The neighbors living on the west side of country lane were vocal. Residents said they never signed up to have this land turned into a subdivision. However, tonight's proposal is different.

Councilwoman **Rebecca Wayment** was on the Planning Commission at the time of the past proposal. She has no heartburn on the current proposal of the barn. However, she would feel more comfortable knowing that the drainage on the parcel will not be impacted by construction of the barn.

Isaacson said he is not sure why a drainage easement was put on the entire parcel if the goal was to preserve open space.

City Attorney **Todd Godfrey** said the City could amend the easement and create an easement that is tied to a specific plan, which could control what goes in in the future. A conservation or stewardship easement may be considered, with restrictions in an actual document.

Petersen said the previous developer didn't want a Homeowner's Association to monitor this area, which made the Planned Unit Development Ordinance not a good option to control future use of the parcel.

Boshell said he doesn't have a problem with releasing enough of the easement for the barn. Enough drainage easements need to be left so adjacent properties can drain onto and through the property. The north side of 650 West Miller Meadows all drains to the north side of this property and ties into the ditch on city-owned property.

Isaacson said that since a drainage easement is a legal restriction on the land, and the barn can be built without interfering with the easement, he is willing to vote in favor. However, he would like to see some restrictions that no further development can occur without approval.

Petersen said this portion of Country Lane to Glovers Lane was high, and sluffed off to this ditch. **Boshell** said some land drains have been put in in the nearby subdivision, which has basements. He wondered if the ground used to be more wet in the past, but due to construction of the subdivision and rerouting of the ditches, it has dried up lately.

Anderson said the he remembers before Fieldstone, kids put a raft back there and floated in the field. However, it no longer floods like that, and is now significantly drier than it has been in the past.

Boshell said there is water in the city-owned ditch to the west of the property year round, although he is not sure where it originates. It seems to come from the direction of Legacy and State Street.

Petersen said the underlying zoning allows a height restriction of 25 feet on the barn, which is basically the height of a house.

Beus asked if the City allows use of this land for a barn, using a conservation or stewardship easement as suggested by **Godfrey**, if there could also be a waiver on the water issues, so that

there is no liability for water damage to the barn. This reminds him of a conservation easement for **Greg Gardner** near Buffalo Ranches. **Godfrey** said he could draft an agreement and consider that.

Mayor Talbot said he is worried about access up and over the curb from Glover Lane. He asked if they should allow cars to park on that, as there is no ingress and egress.

Wayment said she is inclined to approve the barn, but not the site plan that was submitted, as it includes a gravel walkway, parking, and garden area. She is not comfortable with the other items because she is not sure how it would impact drainage through the area.

McFarland said he submitted both a site plan for the 60 foot x 60 foot area, as well as the whole 3-acre parcel. He is only seeking vacating the 60 foot x 60 foot area. The field sits lower than the houses, and the houses have been built up. He does not want the barn to tower over any existing homes, as he respects his neighbors and has sought their input. He said no one seems to mind a barn on 3 acres of open space.

Councilwoman **Amy Shumway** noted that the proposed motion does not mention only the barn site. **Godfrey** suggested that the motion to approve the vacation of the easement can be made with direction to the Staff to bring a draft in the future to restrict construction to the barn. It can be put on a future agenda as a summary action item, allowing for approval of the final document. That way the applicant can know he can move forward with plans for the barn.

Motion:

Shumway moved that the City Council approve a request to amend a drainage easement on Parcel 3 of Farmington Creek Estates Phase III PUD Plat and concurrently amend the plat related thereto for Parcel 3, subject to all Farmington City ordinances and standards, with the condition that the final barn site and portion of the easement to be vacated will be determined by Staff as part of the building permit process, and come back under a summary action list with an amended easement document for approval.

Wayment seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

SUMMARY ACTION:

Minute Motion Approving Summary Action List

The Council considered the Summary Action List including approval of surplus property, namely a 2005 Chevrolet Colorado truck that was totaled in an accident in 2020.

Motion:

Shumway moved to approve the Summary Action list items as noted in the staff report.

Beus seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

GOVERNING BODY REPORTS:

City Manager Report

Pace presented the Building Activity Report and Fire Monthly Activity Report for December, including annual fire and EMS awards. He mentioned that the flashing beacon lights are up and functioning at the Denver and Rio Grande Western Rail Trail (D&RGW Trail) and Clark Lane. There are plans to move forward with other beacons. There are five more streets that the D&RGW Trail crosses. **Pace** said he would like to have beacons set up at all five and included in the current budget year. Waiting for the next budget is too long. As such, he told the Council to expect a budget adjustment for this toward the end of the budget year, to come out of fund balance.

Beus said safety is and should remain one of the City's top duties.

Mayor Talbot and City Council Reports

Wayment said she is pleased to see cross training in the fire department, which can deepen the Staff's ability to help out in times of need.

Beus said the Mosquito Abatement District met last week and considered extending the CRA 1 and CRA 2 for Farmington North. That vacant land is causing more problems, and they approved the extension unanimously.

Anderson said he appreciates **Pace** dealing with citizens' issues, and enjoys reading his responses to them.

Pace said there is a great desire to hold Festival Days this summer, as it was cancelled last summer due to the pandemic. A lot depends on how quickly the vaccine gets out through the community. The upcoming newsletter will inform residents of how to get the vaccine at the Legacy Center, with encouragement for those who qualify to get it. The county health department is not letting any vaccine go to the wayside, as they are calling people to come get any unused at the end of the day.

Mayor Talbot said he is closely watching the COVID case counts as provided by regular weekly conference calls with the Board of Health. According to the most recent statistics over the last 14 days, 4 percent of Farmington's cases are due to travel, 33 percent household exposure, 1 percent work exposure, 15 percent from known contact, 21 percent unknown, and 25 percent under investigation.

So far, Farmington has had a total of 2,012 positive cases, with 187 total active current cases. Kaysville has had a total of 2,911 positive cases, with 222 total active current cases. The two cities are similar in population. The larger city of Bountiful has had 3,795 positive cases, with 310 active current cases. Centerville has had 1,388 cases, with 99 current active cases. **Mayor Talbot** said with more taking the vaccine, he hopes to be back to normality in the next few months.

Pace said the City will need to consider a policy issue involving federal regulations about providing time off for employees exposed to or with the COVID virus. The current policy covering employees in quarantine ended December 31, 2020. Congress is considering extending that. In the meantime, Farmington administration has decided to continue that benefit until Congress makes a future decision. It is difficult to provide it, then take it away, only to reinstate it again, **Pace** said. He also wants the employees to feel comfortable to report when they test positive or have been exposed to the virus in order to minimize the infection rate in the workplace population. Although there is frustration because there is room for abuse, Farmington City employees have been handling it well so far.

CLOSED SESSION

Motion:

Anderson made the motion to go into a closed meeting for the purpose of property acquisition and litigation. **Isaacson** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Sworn Statement

I, **Jim Talbot**, Mayor of Farmington City, do hereby affirm that the items discussed in the closed meeting were as stated in the motion to go into closed session and that no other business was conducted while the council was so convened in a closed meeting.

Jim Talbot, Mayor

Motion:

Anderson made a motion to reconvene to an open meeting. The motion was seconded by **Shumway**, which was unanimously approved.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

Beus made a motion to adjourn the meeting. **Wayment** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Heidi Bouck, Recorder